The Constitution Versus the Articles of Confederation

By **Alan Lewis Painter**

Rev. July 22, 2010

We have all heard about and extolled the virtues of the Constitution. It has even been said that it is divinely inspired. Originally, however, there was the Articles of Confederation, which was in effect prior to the Constitution. Did we, do we, need the Constitution? What was wrong with the Articles of Confederation? Anything at all? Listening to many patriotic individuals lends the impression that the Constitution is positively wonderful. The Articles of Confederation, on the other hand, seems to be all but forgotten. Today we hear of the NESARA law and, with it's implementation, the possibility of turning back the clock, i.e., dissolving all statutory law back to just before the Civil War, circa 1860. On the surface, this would seem to be just what the proverbial doctor ordered. Is it? Is 1860 sufficiently far back? Perhaps we should reconsider.

NESARA is an acronym for the **National Economic Security and Reformation Act**. Among the changes it will usher in are such things as **(1)** dissolution of the Federal Reserve and it's sister plague the IRS; **(2)** a return to so-called constitutional money (hard-metal-based currency with "intrinsic" value, as opposed to debt-bearing, no-value, fiat scrip); **(3)** universal debt forgiveness; **(4)** restitution for unconstitutional tax-collection practices; (5) return to common law (having a no harm-no foul mentality), as opposed to the commercial or admiralty law that has infested our courts for many years; **(6)** reinstatement of the Title of Nobility (original Thirteenth) Amendment; (7) dissolution of all statutory law back to the Civil War; and more. Seemingly wonderful changes all. However, despite the sound of it, it occurs to me that we need to take a closer look at the dissolution of statutory law back to the Civil War. My concern is whether that will be going far enough back in time. Do we need to dissolve the Constitution and return to the Articles of Confederation?

What was formed first?

Consider: first there was ***The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America*** (note the capitalization), which we know today as the Declaration of Independence, the ***Articles of Confederation and perpetual union between the states of Newhampshire, Massachusetts Bay, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia,***

which we know today as the Articles of Confederation, and the ***Constitution of the United States of America***, now known as, simply, the Constitution. Notice that the Articles came before the Constitution.

When the so-called founders went into the so-called constitutional convention (so named after the fact for what it produced) their charter was to revise the Articles of Confederation. How is it, then, that they created something entirely different? Yes, I am aware that the states had to sign off on it, but the delegates still went well outside their mandate. By what authority did they do this?

Jesuit influence

Referring to F. Tupper Sauccy's ***Rulers of Evil***, and Eric Jon Phelps' ***Vatican Assassins*** we learn of the Society of Jesus, known more popularly as the Jesuits, and their leader, the Jesuit General or Black Pope (the power behind the throne, as opposed to the White Pope, the public face of the Vatican). These authors teach us that, among other things:

- The Jesuits control essentially the entire world;
- The Jesuits have arbitrarily divided the world into approximately 83 Jesuit provinces, each headed by a so-called provincial that is directly subordinate to the Jesuit General;
- The Jesuit General influenced the signing of the Constitution for the United States of America;
- The cardinal of New York, the so-called military vicar who is subordinate to the Jesuit General, is the King of the "American Empire," and Presidents are subordinate to him;
- The land on which Washington D.C. stands was originally owned by a Jesuit and is shown on Maps of that time as New Rome;
- All iconography in and on the Capitol dome today is Roman;
- The fasces, an axe surrounded by a bundle of rods, the international symbol of fascism, adorns the Senate Chamber;
- In Congress today all committee heads are, first and foremost, Catholic; and
- All esoteric orders (Masonic, Rosicrucian, etc.), fraternities and religions, at their very highest levels, and unbeknown to the masses below, report to the Black Pope and his inner circle, often referred to in esoteric circles as "unknown superiors."

How many of us are aware of these things? I had no clue until I read those two books and a few others. These things aren't taught in public schools.

What, you may ask, do these things have to do with our founding documents? Answering that requires looking at the definitions, and a few other

things. In so doing it should be apparent that we need to reevaluate virtually everything we know about the founding of the United States.

Articles of Confederation

Let us first look at the Articles of Confederation. The following is taken from ***Bouvier's Law Dictionary***, 1887, page 148:

> **ARTICLES OF CONFEDERATION.**
> The title of the compact which was made by the thirteen original states [**former colonies**] of the United States of America.

Immediately it becomes apparent that the Articles was not created directly by the people, but by the states or colonies on behalf of the People. This is a critical point: the states, via the Articles, created the United States of America, not the other way around. Continuing:

> **2.** The full title was, "Articles of Confederation and perpetual union between the states of New Hampshire, Massachusetts Bay, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia." It was adopted and went into force on the first day of March 1781, and remained as the supreme law until the first Wednesday of March 1789 [**when the Constitution of the United States of America took effect**].
>
> The accompanying analysis of this important instrument is copied from Judge Story's Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States, book 2, c. 3.
>
> **3.** The style of the new confederacy was, by the first article, declared to be, "The United States of America." The second article declared that each state retained its sovereignty, freedom, and independence, and every power, jurisdiction, and right which was not by this confederation expressly delegated to the United States, in congress assembled. The third article declared that the states severally entered into a firm league of friendship with each other, for their common defense, the security of their liberties, and their mutual and general welfare; binding themselves to assist each other against all force offered to or attacks made upon them, or any of them, on account of religion, sovereignty, trade, or any other pretense whatever. The fourth article declared that the free inhabitants of each of the states (vagabonds and fugitives from justice excepted) should be entitled to all the privileges of free citizens in the several states; that the people of each state should have free ingress and regress to and from any other state, and should enjoy all the privileges of trade and commerce, subject to the same duties and restrictions as the inhabitants; that fugitives from justice should, upon the demand of the executive of the state from which they fled, be delivered up; and that full faith and credit should be given, in each of the states, to the records, acts, and judicial proceedings of the courts and magistrates of every other state.

The summarization of the Articles continues for more than a page describing each of the individual articles. However, the portion presented above is enough to give the sense of what was created and by whom.

Since the states formed this "league of friendship" wherein each state retained its sovereignty, the United States of America is a creature of the states acting for and on behalf of the states, with the blessing of the states. Thus—and let this be clearly understood—the United States of America originally was not created as a country. Each state, a sovereign country equal in status to each other state, limitedly joined with the other states for mutual benefit—without giving up its independence. A confederation does not a country make. On the contrary, the entity created by the Articles is more on the order of a council (an assembly or an advisory body).

During the Civil War, the United States government objected to the southern states seceding from the Union. If in fact each state retained its independence or sovereignty from the other states, and if the United States of America is a creature of the states, by what authority did the Union object to the southern states' secession? No matter how highly Lincoln valued the "Union" of states, a servant has no authority to bind the masters. The idea that the federal government forcibly bound the southern states to the Union has bothered me for years.

While there is provision in the Articles that the union should be perpetual, this does not mean that an independent country could not secede from this league of friendship should the people of that state so desire. "Perpetual" means only that there is no set end date. To suggest otherwise is to argue that the states really had not retained autonomy and independence. Does the Articles stipulate that a state cannot secede? No, but it clearly says that each state maintains its sovereignty and independence.

Constitution

Let us now refer again to ***Bouvier's Law Dictionary***, 1887, page 335:

> **CONSTITUTION.**
> The fundamental law of a free country which characterizes the organism of the country and secures the rights of the citizen and determines his main duties as a freeman.

Wait a minute. I can see why the states, free or sovereign *countries*, would have constitutions. However, why would the United States of America, a confederation, a collaboration between or a collective of free countries, have a constitution? When did the United States itself become a country? Yes, I know, we all think of the United States of America as a country, but the Articles in no way states or implies that the United States of America is a country. To repeat, the Articles stipulates that it is a "league" of friendship, what amounts to an assembly or an advisory body. Today, however, we are faced with a United States Constitution that is "the fundamental law of a free *country*." Are the hairs on your neck standing up yet?

Continuing with the definition of constitution on page 336:

> **2.** *Constitution*, in the former law of the European continent, signified as much as decree,—a decree of importance, especially ecclesiastical decrees. The decrees of the Roman emperors referring to the *jus circa sacra* [**right over holy matters**], contained in the Code of Justinian, have been repeatedly collected and called the Constitutions. The famous bull *Unigenitus* [**named for it's opening words: "Unigentus dei filius" or "Only-begotten son of God"**] was usually called in France the Constitution. Comprehensive laws or decrees have been called constitutions, thus, the *Consitutio Criminalis Carolina*, which is the penal code decreed by Charles V. for Germany. In political law the word constitution came to be used more and more for the fundamentals of a government,—the laws and usages which give it its characteristic feature. We find, thus, former English writers speak of the constitution of the Turkish empire. These fundamental laws and customs appeared to our race especially important where they limited the power and action of the different branches of government; and it came thus to pass that by constitution was meant especially the fundamental law of a state in which the citizen enjoys a high degree of civil liberty; and, as it is equally necessary to guard against the power of the executive in monarchies, a period arrived—namely, the first half of the present century—when in Europe and especially on the continent, the term constitutional government came to be used in contradistinction to absolutism.
>
> **3.** We now mean by the term constitution, in common parlance, the fundamental law of a free country which characterizes the organism of the country and secures the rights of the citizen and determines his main duties as a freeman. Sometimes, indeed, the word constitution has been used in recent times for what otherwise is generally called an organic law. Napoleon I. styled himself Emperor of the French by the Grace of God and the Constitutions of the Empire.

There is more to this definition, but this will suffice for our purposes.

So, constitutions date back to Rome and are considered comprehensive laws or decrees—of a country. Today, in common parlance, a constitution is considered "the fundamental law of a free *country* or *state*." Thus, we seem to have a contradiction between the Articles and the Constitution.

Beyond the obvious, that a constitution has to do with a country, notice that other countries, like France, have constitutions and that the constitution of France was, apparently, one of the constitutions of "the Empire," referring to the Roman Empire. Maybe it still is.

Also in paragraph 3 of the quotation: when speaking of a "*free* country," in what sense is "free" meant? As a country with free or sovereign citizens, or as a country free and independent of other countries? If the latter, how free is free?

Does the idea of empire coincide with that of *sovereign* citizens? Do the countries of Europe, for instance, have sovereign citizens, or do they have subject-class citizens—or simply subjects?

According to the above definition, a Constitution "secures the rights of the citizen and *determines his main duties as a freeman*." Would a servant "league of friendship" between countries determine a freeman's duties?

What kind of country was created by the Constitution? Did the founders (at least those that pushed for a Constitution) contemplate a country that is part of an Empire, or one comparable to the original countries or states of the American Union?

Lastly, if the United States is a country, do the states, which are countries, fit inside of or belong to the United States of America, another country? Does one country rule or encompass all the others? It sounds like a Russian-doll scenario, except that instead of dolls of varying sizes, each doll fitting inside of another in succession of size, we seem to have thimble-size dolls all fitting together into one foot-tall doll. Does this analogy make any sense? Can a country that is sovereign relative to other countries, with geographical boundaries (land mass) and sovereign citizens, fit into another country having the same? Think about geography (land mass) alone.

Consider: can acorns A, B and C fit into or be a part of Acorn D? Does this work? Why not? It doesn't work because, at the least, Acorn D would lose its physical integrity as an acorn (in the process of fitting the other acorns into it), or all the acorns would be destroyed in the process. It is functionally impossible. Conceptually, putting one or many countries within another country doesn't work for somewhat the same reason. Putting a land mass inside another land mass isn't remotely possible. If the land mass of the United States of America is the District of Columbia, the enclaves and the territories, which are entirely different land masses than Arizona or any other Union state (country), can the land mass of Arizona be physically placed inside the District of Columbia, or any other land mass?

So, how does this idea of the many-countries-into-one really work? The many countries would become provinces of (losing their sovereignty in subordination to) the one country, i.e., the land masses of the many are *politically* subsumed by the one, which means the states are no longer countries.

Oh that's right, the states are Republics that fit into a super Republic. Isn't that the line? If Republics are countries, this scenario likewise disintegrates. One country cannot subsume another country without their very natures changing. Something would have to give, and I don't mean in a tit-for-tat sort of way. Some element in that equation would be destroyed, as shown above. Are Republics *sovereign* countries?

Originally, the United States of America was not intended to be a country, and yet the Constitution, or at least ***Bouvier's law Dictionary***, 1887 Ed, would lead us to believe that it has become a country.

Ex parté Frank Knowles

In 1855, in determining whether California courts had the power to naturalize, the California Supreme Court spoke about the expression "citizen of the United States" saying:

> By metaphysical refinement, in examining the form of our government, it might be correctly said that there is no such thing as a citizen of the United States. But constant usage—arising from convenience, and perhaps necessity, and dating from the formation of the Confederacy—has given substantial existence to the idea which the term conveys. A citizen of any one of the States of the Union, is held to be, and called a citizen of the United States. Although technically and abstractly there is no such thing. To conceive a citizen of the United States who is not a citizen of some one of the States, is totally foreign to the idea, and inconsistent with the proper construction and common understanding of the expression as used in the Constitution, which must he deduced from its various other provisions. The object then to be attained, by the exercise of the power of naturalization, was to make citizens of the respective States.[1]

Why is there "technically and abstractly" no such thing as a citizen of the United States? The United States of America, per the Articles, isn't a country. Thus the expression is a general one referring to "a citizen of any one of the States (countries) of the Union (League of Friendship)." One would naturally conclude that the power of naturalization was to make state citizens—because, under the Articles, there wasn't any other kind of citizenship. Furthermore, if the intention is to make state citizens, it would be logical that the states themselves perform the naturalizing, i.e., make their own citizens. Ostensibly, the intention, per the Constitution, was for the United States Congress to agree on the *rules* of naturalization to be applied by the states such that each state would naturalize its citizens in the same way as the other states. Thus, all newly made citizens in all the states would be equal or equivalent. Yes, the states would have to do the naturalizing because, under the Articles, they are countries, and the United States of America isn't.

Notice, though, that the Knowles court refers to both the Articles and the Constitution. Bearing in mind that while one creates a confederation or *council* and the other a *country* (which *could* have its own citizens), the Knowles court seems to have missed the distinction, relying primarily on the Articles. Again we run head long into the contradiction.

The Articles speaks of "free inhabitants in each of the states" and "free citizens in the several states," but never mentions "citizens of the United States." While the Constitution does mention them, the Knowles court tells us that they are really state citizens. The implication is that the California Supreme Court in 1855 did not construe the United States as a country. If the California Supreme Court misconstrued, and if the United States of America is a country, would the states still have to do the naturalizing?

Wouldn't it have been clearer for the Constitution to specifically refer to State citizens, if that were really intended? Did the writers of the Constitution intend that United States citizens were really state citizens? How do we know? Why call state citizens something other than what they were?

---

[1] **Ex parté Frank Knowles**, 5 Cal. 300, 302 (1855).

On the other hand, if the United States of America became a country (or really a province) of the Roman empire under the Constitution, it makes sense that the Constitution would define the duties of *its* citizens? In that scenario, a province of the Roman Empire, the United States of America, could have sub-provinces, and the whole thing is like Russian dolls. Rome would subsume all countries (major provinces) of the world, and some of those provinces would be divided into sub-provinces (states). The land mass is all land in the world, and the subdivisions are strictly political. In this scenario, the Fourteenth Amendment makes sense. It reads as follows, in pertinent part:

> **Section 1:** All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of the citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

If the Knowles Court is correct about US citizenship being a general reference to state Citizenship (due to the United States of America being a council), the Fourteenth Amendment seemingly is without authority. It doesn't fit the scheme of the Articles.

On the other hand, one can be a citizen of the United States, first, and a citizen of a state, second, when the distinction between the United States and the states is strictly political. Two citizenships would make sense in the United-States-as-a-country-or-province model.

Notice also that the rest of the paragraph seems to be speaking of rights. Why are rights spoken of in the Fourteenth Amendment? Those rights are for its subject-class citizens.

Subject-class citizenship

The Preamble to the Bill of Rights, which today typically is not printed with the Bill of Rights, tells us:

> The conventions of a number of the States having at the time of their adopting the Constitution, expressed a desire, in order to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers, that further declaratory and restrictive clauses should be added.

These restrictive clauses limited the powers of the United States by way of acknowledging some rights that state Citizens have. However, these were not all the rights held by state citizens, but merely a select, representative portion of them. It was considered, and rightly so since the People formed the states, that the Constitution of the United States of America did not create or bestow their rights, but rather protected them (by way of acknowledgment of those rights and by limitation on government power). In other words, Citizens' rights preexisted the Constitution—and the Articles. The reason for the Bill of Rights being ap-

pended to the Constitution was to protect rights that, theoretically, already existed. Thus, the "declaratory and restrictive clauses" of the Bill of Rights essentially prohibited government from infringing on state citizens' preexisting rights.

Notice, however, that under the Articles, the United States of America would have had no authority, or even opportunity, to abuse or take cognizance of the Peoples rights, because it was subservient to the States and because it existed solely to handle certain matters on behalf of the states. Furthermore, under the Constitution, that apparently created a country, there *is* the possibility (not to mention the likelihood) of abuse, thus the need for the "further declaratory and restrictive clauses." The addition of the Bill of Rights tends to infer that someone recognized the difference between the Articles and the Constitution and, thus, the need to protect against it.

It should be noted that the Knowles case was decided before the Civil War (1861-65), the Thirteenth Amendment (1865), the 1866 Civil Rights Act and the Fourteenth Amendment (1868).

The Civil War set the stage for the Thirteenth Amendment that freed the slaves. In the following year, 1866, the Civil Rights Act provided so-called "civil" rights for a subject-class of citizenry that, *theoretically*, did not at the time exist. What were these "civil" rights? Some, though not all, of the rights listed in the Bill of Rights. That list of "civil" rights (for a subject-class citizenry) has been legislatively expanded over the years. Of courses, if subject-class citizens didn't exist at the time, what was the point?

Then the Fourteenth Amendment, two years later in 1868, seemingly created a subject-class citizenship called, confusingly enough, United States citizens (when, theoretically, there previously had been only sovereign-class state Citizens) in recognition of the Dred Scott case, which noted that blacks who had been freed from slavery nonetheless had neither (state) Citizenship nor political rights. Thus, the Civil Rights Act and the Fourteenth Amendment.

Certainly blacks, fellow human beings, deserved Citizenship. Didn't they? However, did they deserve a subject-class citizenship? Why, pray tell, create that type of citizenship at all? Isn't that simply re-creating slavery in a somewhat different form? It sounds like giving with one hand (the Thirteenth Amendment) and taking with the other (the 1866 Civil Rights Act and the Fourteenth Amendment). Most likely, in line with the Jesuit's design to rule the world, that type of citizenship was designed to eventually include all of us, but such a shift had to be accomplished very slowly, as the sovereign-class Citizens of the Civil War era probably were still fairly clear about who they were.

More than likely the Constitution referred to United States citizens instead of state Citizens because all citizens were intended, from the beginning, to be subject class in concert within the Roman Empire model. The Civil War, along with the amendments and the act that immediately followed, collectively was the second step toward subject-class citizenship for all—the first step being the Con-

stitution itself. Today the federal government treats all of us like subject-class citizens.

Has a plan (conspiracy) been carried out over a *very long* time, perhaps even since the creation of the Constitution, to subvert the freedom movement of those who wrote the Declaration of Independence and the Articles of Confederation? I think so.

Originally "citizen" was written with a lower case "c," bearing in mind that there was only one type of citizenship. However, today's Patriot or Tax Honesty Movement has adopted "Citizen" with a capital "C" to distinguish sovereign-class from subject-class citizenship, for clarity's sake. Thus, my alternation of the two spellings is purposeful.

What is going on?

If the United States of America is not a country (per the Articles), how is it that it can have citizens or a constituency? If it is a country, how and when did it become a country? It became a country when the Articles of Confederation (a compact between states that essentially created a council that was a creature of the states) was traded in for a Constitution (the fundamental law of a country). However when the Constitution was first implemented, even though the rug quite literally had been pulled out from under us, seemingly the concept of the-United-states-as-a-country wasn't pushed until after the Civil War, which was the real reason for the Civil War: to take the next step in the conspirators' agenda for the "New World Order" with an empire-like United States (a country or province of the Empire) with sub-provinces (today's states), even though they hadn't yet coined the phrase "New World Order."

This would seem to be a fairly logical conclusion provided we can trust Bouvier's Law Dictionary, 1887 Ed. Can we trust it?

Council or Country?

What exactly was the charter given to the delegates of the so-called Constitutional Convention? From the final paragraph of the relevant resolution:

> Resolved that in the opinion of Congress it is expedient that on the second Monday in May next a Convention of delegates who shall have been appointed by the several states be held at Philadelphia for the sole and express purpose of revising the Articles of Confederation and reporting to Congress and the several legislatures such alteration and provisions therein as shall when agreed to in Congress and confirmed by the states render the federal constitution adequate to the exigencies of Government & the preservation of the Union.[2]

---

[2] ***United States: Formation of the Union*** (Documents), Library of Congress, **Report of Proceeding in Congress, Wednesday, February 21, 1787**, page 46.

It could be said that the words "federal constitution" appear and, thus, authority is given to create the "Constitution," but that would seem to be a misreading. It is more likely that those words refer to what existed at the time of the resolution; the Constitution, as we now know it today, did not exist then. Thus, "constitution" should be taken to mean the "composition" of the Articles. When reading, replace "constitution" with "composition" or "make-up," to get the gist of the resolution.

The specific intention was to upgrade or "revise" the Articles, not to create something new. Nonetheless, the delegates returned with an entirely new beast.

It might be said that the Articles are still in force and effect. However, notice that from the second section of "Articles of Confederation" in ***Bouvier's Law Dictionary***, quoted above:

> It **[the Articles of Confederation]** was adopted and went into force on the first day of March, 1781, and remained as the supreme law until the first Wednesday of March, 1789.

Apparently the Articles ceased to be the "supreme law" in March of 1789.

The Knowles court, by referring to the Articles, seems to suggest that the Articles are still somewhere in the background. However, if it is no longer the "supreme law," does it still have authority? If so, exactly what is that authority? Since the Articles and the Constitution seem to describe the United States of America in different ways, according to ***Bouvier's Law Dictionary***, can they both still be functioning? If the Articles is still in force, i.e., if it is still functioning in the background, it would seem to be in conflict with the Constitution. ***Bouvier's*** *seems* to be telling us that the Articles was replaced by the Constitution.

Interestingly, the Articles and the Constitution both refer to the United States of America. Unfortunately, this is confusing. My preference would be to have styled the entity created by the Articles as the "Council of American States," which more clearly would have embodied its function, which would have made it more difficult for the Constitution to confuse the issue, and which would have made it more difficult to create citizens of the Council. "United States of America" was a poor choice, although those who drafted the Articles probably didn't expect what happened in the so-called Constitutional Convention.

Oaths

Bearing in mind that the Articles created a league of friendship between sovereign countries that was a servant to those sovereign countries, let us look at the Article 6, Section 3 of the Constitution:

> The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the members of the several state legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several states, shall be bound by oath or affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.

Per the Articles, which created a United States of America that is a servant to the states, state officials seemingly don't operate under the United States Constitution. Do they? So, why would they take an oath to support the United States Constitution? What is wrong with this picture? Seemingly it is backwards, i.e., this section has the State officers taking an oath of fealty to a document that creates a servant of the states. This makes no sense whatever...unless of course the master became the servant and the servant the master. It makes perfect sense if the states have become sub-provinces of a higher level province.

The Constitution's Preamble

The Preamble of the Constitution states:

> We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

It is clear from the Preamble to the Articles that the state delegates in convention, on behalf of the states they represented, formed the original United States of America. In the Constitution's Preamble, however, the "People" are speaking. Specifically, what people might those be? Presumably the delegates of the Constitutional Convention. However if so, why refer to the People rather than the delegates in convention? The delegates had no authority to speak on behalf of the states' inhabitants; they could speak only on behalf of the states that sent them into convention. The fact that the states theoretically were acting on behalf of the inhabitants, not withstanding. While most of us would like to believe that the "People" are the state inhabitants of that time, it seems to me the identity of the People is an open question.

Note also that in the phrase, "We the People of the United States...," the U in United is capitalized, indicating that United States is a proper noun. Thus that phrase does not refer to the inhabitants of the States united (in common purpose). Furthermore, is "United States" different from "United States of America?" How many variations of the title are there? Moreover, what do those variations tell us?

Note further the reference to a "more perfect" union. More perfect how, and from whose point of view? Neither is specified.

Moreover, considering that the United States of America already had a founding document, the Articles, why write another *type* of founding document? On the other hand, if the Articles was being voided, why is there no indication of that in the Constitution?

My sense of all this is that the Constitution is a masterpiece of deception. No matter how many commentators have extolled the virtues of the Constitu-

tion, we need to reevaluate everything we know about it and about American History.

Who did it?

So, whose bright idea was the Constitution?

Sauccy and Phelps both have told us that the Jesuits, for all practical purposes, ruled the world. When the colonists broke away from King George of Great Britain, who was controlled by the Jesuits, they transformed the colonies into states (or countries) and had their state legislatures form a collective, that was a creature of those states, to perform certain functions on behalf of the states and the People. Doubtless this act of defiance infuriated King George and the Jesuits who temporarily lost control of the colonies.

Darryll Freck in his Friday night Lightworkers conference call told this story a couple of times in May 2010: Apparently Benjamin Franklin, John Jay, and John Adams went to Paris, France, to negotiate the treaty of peace at the end of the Revolutionary War. However, upon landing, they were taken into custody and charged with treason. It seems they were all Esquires that had taken oaths to Great Britain to become attorneys. Esquire, of course, is a title of nobility, and these three were, thus, subjects of Great Britain and, in turn, the Vatican. It seems these three patriots, in their zeal to free the colonies from Britain, had forgotten who they were. Apparently these three were persuaded, upon pain of death, the penalty for treason, to again carry out the wishes of the English and Roman masters.

I haven't seen any documentation to back up Darryll's story, but it seems to fit perfectly into the thesis I have constructed, and it explains a great deal.

Subsequently Franklin found his way into the Constitutional Convention as a delegate from Pennsylvania. One must wonder how many others in the Convention were also agents of the Crown/Vatican who are today heralded as founders and saviors. Furthermore, John Adams subsequently served as President, while an attorney (Esquire) subject to Britain.

As noted earlier, the delegates' directive from Congress was to "revise" the Articles. However once in convention, it is likely that Jesuit agents pressed for the Constitution as the only way to re-enforce the Articles. They were, of course, changing the game, covertly converting the United States of America from a servant council into an empire-like country or province. (Note that today New York is known as the Empire State, implying that it is part of an empire, probably the Jesuit's Roman Empire. Also, Rudi Giuliani told us in one his speeches that New York City is the Capital of the World.) Seemly many of the state courts, like the California Supreme Court in the Knowles case, did not recognize what had happened, and were still operating under the delusion that the United States of America was the collective servant of the states. On the other hand, perhaps the state courts recognized very well what had happened and were, with their deci-

sions, rejecting the transformation perpetrated by the Constitutional Convention. Regardless, it would seem, the Constitution resulted in the United States of America no longer being the creature of the states.

Subsequent to the Civil War, the wolves in Congress removed their sheep clothing and revealed themselves for what they were, agent provocateurs controlled by the Jesuits.

Both Sauccy and Phelps tell us that the Lincoln assassination was planned by the Jesuits and executed by their agents. Apparently Lincoln realized what was happening or, more likely, had a change of heart, like JFK, and shifted gears in an attempt to stall their plan. Since then, there has been an ever-increasing negative decent.

Furthermore, Phelps tells us that the same can be said of the Kennedys' assassinations, for the same reason. It is likely that the Jesuits were behind other Presidential assassinations and assassination attempts, as well.

The Jesuits are the body of a giant octopus that has a multitude of tentacles throughout the world, or at least it is one of the major ruling factions.

As an aside, Federal Reserve Notes originally were hard-metal backed, like Silver Certificates, but after a short while, the backing was stealthily removed. They keep reusing the same gradual-and-stealthy game plan over and over. Hey, if it ain't broke, don't fix it. Why change what works?

Civil Flag

The first common-law flag was displayed by the Sons of Liberty on the so-called Liberty Tree where the stamp agent was hanged in effigy to protest the Stamp Act. This flag had 9 *vertical* red and white stripes, with no field.

During the American Revolution, General Washington flew the so-called Grand Union flag having 13 red and white horizontal stripes with a Union Jack in the corner which, coincidentally, was the flag of the British East India Company. It was flown for over a year after the signing of the Declaration of Independence. Apparently this flag was recommended to Benjamin Franklin by one known only as "the professor," later reputed to be one Lorenzo Ricci, the Jesuit General of that time.

In 1799, Oliver Wolcott, Jr., Treasury Secretary under John Adams (who was one of those esquires charged with treason, mentioned earlier), designed the first civil flag, of 16 red and white stripes plus (allegedly) an eagle with blue stars on a white field, for use on nonmilitary ships, specifically revenue cutters collecting tariffs and other taxes imposed on imports. It seems more likely to me that the bird was a phoenix, for occult (Roman) purposes. In this sense, it would seem, the phoenix, the Roman Empire, rose from the ashes of the Declaration of Independence and the Articles of Confederation to renewed life via the Constitution.

In 1874, Treasury Secretary William A. Richardson required a civil flag to be displayed in all customs houses. This flag had red and white *vertical* stripes plus blue stars on a white field.[3]

While the article that the information in this section comes from extolls the virtues of the civil flag, it seems clear that the genesis of this flag is British/Roman, or was at least commandeered by the Vatican-inspired founders. If "the professor" was indeed the Jesuit General, it is inferred that the American Revolution was hijacked before it ever got off the ground. They knew certain factions in the colonies were restless, so they encouraged (from behind the scenes) the Revolutionary War. They had the colonists expend all their energy, both human and financial, made it appear that the colonists won the war, charged with treason the three delegates sent to negotiate the terms of peace, thus turning the tables on the colonists with a non-favorable Treaty of Peace, and then forced a Roman Constitution on them that prevails to this day. What a coo for the British/Vatican. Of course, the Vatican could afford as much war as was necessary to accomplish its ends; money was no object, and the loss of life on either side was irrelevant.

US like UN

Via the Articles, the United States of America, as a council or deliberative body, is similar to what we know today as the United Nations. In that vein, I have always wondered why a United Nations-like body would belong to another United Nations. Does this make any kind of sense? By the way, is the United Nations thought of as a country? If not, why do we think of the United States of America as country? Oh that's right, our politicians and US courts have been parroting this idea since just after the Civil War.

Of course, if the United States had become a country, more on the order of a province, then it could reasonably belong to the United Nations along with all the other country-provinces. In turn, that would explain why Lincoln saw it as his duty to keep the Union (of Roman sub-provinces) intact. He was maintaining control for his Roman masters. It tends to make sense. Doesn't it?

Back to the beginning

At the beginning of this treatise I said that among the changes ushered in by NESARA would be a dissolution of 150 years of statutory law all the way back to the Civil War. While I would agree that the training wheels visibly came off during the Civil War, really the proverbial train had been derailed by the Constitutional Convention, and even before that. Dissolving statutory law to before the Civil War still leaves intact the Constitution and the "country-province" of the United States of America created thereby. There is no question that the changes

---

[3] The information in this section came from an article entitled, ***History of the US Civil Flag***. See: http://www.uscivilflags.org/articles-history.html

NESARA law is to usher in will go a long way to restoring American life, but dissolution of statutory law back to the Civil War, unfortunately, would seem to be insufficient.

That said, however, it must be noted that part of the remedy for America is the original thirteenth Amendment that banned titles of nobility upon pain of loss of (US) citizenship, bearing in mind that the original Thirteenth Amendment is part of the Constitution, not the Articles. This is one more example—the Bill of Rights is the first—of the states realizing what had taken place with the advent of the Constitution and doing what they could to right the ship—without reverting to the Articles. Perhaps that is the reason for NESARA's *partial* dissolution of statutory law. In fact, it occurs to me that to go back to the articles would require another convention of the states to draft a new Articles of Confederation.

Thus, once the remedy is used and the house is cleaned, so to speak, my suggestion is: we need to scrap the Constitution and finish the original job of revising the Articles of Confederation. The United States of America must once again be a servant to the states and the United Nations-like council for a league of sovereign countries that it was designed to be. Either that, or perhaps we don't need a United States of America at all. Perhaps the states could all, individually, join a (revitalized) United Nations, in which case we would just dissolve the United States government altogether. Just a thought. Another possibility is that groups of countries around the world could form their own councils, and delegates from those councils could meet in a world council, in which case we would need to reconstitute the Articles of Confederation. The latter would seem to be the most appropriate scenario.

By the way, it should be noted that when the Constitution is voided in favor of the Articles, there will be no longer an *ambiguous* United States citizenship, because there will won't be a province to be a citizen of—the understanding of the Knowles case notwithstanding. We will then be left solely with an uncluttered, sovereign, state Citizenship.

Revising the Articles

In re-instituting and revising the Articles, which I believe must be done, consider the following:

- It should be specifically stated what is being created. It is important in this regard to be literal, so that it is clear and obvious on the surface what is being created. One should not need to be a legal scholar to understand what it says.
- Along with this idea, I would like to see the United States of America renamed the Council of American States, a deliberative and advisory body that handles certain functions on behalf of the States, although those functions will need to be updated and made very specific.

- In terms of *construction*, each paragraph should stand on its own. The reader should not be forced to reference annotations or convention notes to know "what" it says. It is one thing for an annotation to give "reasons for" and the "history of" what the paragraph states. However, an "explanation" of what it says is out of order. A paragraph that needs explaining doesn't speak for itself and lends itself to *interpretation* by so-called experts. A prime example of a section that does not speak for itself is the Sixteenth Amendment that, amazingly enough, the Supreme Court told us was for "clarification." Thus, each section and clause must speak for itself. In this regard, I don't ever want to have to consult writings of the "founders" to determine *what* they intended. *What* they intended ought to be obvious on the surface. The document should be carefully crafted so as not to leave questions regarding what is intended.
- From the standpoint of a table of contents, Article 1, Article 2, etc., tell the reader nothing about what is contained therein. In this regard, a lesson can be learned from statutory law when it is indicated that headings are not part of the law itself, but are, rather, organizational guides. Thus, only paragraphs of text should be numbered, never the headings, and a heading should tell us something about the content of the paragraph. Careful attention to this idea would render a table of contents making the document much more useable or user friendly.
- A paragraph with subparagraphs following should be an introductory paragraph leading to those subparagraphs that follow. A paragraph with no subparagraphs following should make a direct statement.
- Amendments ought to be listed separately as a quick reference, as currently done for the Constitution, but also should be inserted into the body of the Articles where appropriate with the Amendment number noted at the end of the section. Thus, the body of the Articles grows via the amendment process.
- Inordinately long, convoluted sentences should be avoided. Such sentence structure was an affectation of attorneys, and is very difficult to read through without stumbling and misunderstanding. Along with this idea, sentences written in the negative should be avoided because they tend to be exceedingly awkward, not to mention too long.

From a technical-writing perspective, the Constitution is a disaster, and the Articles but little better, thus strict attention to construction (apart from its content) is critical. As shown above, technical writing provides a number of useful guidelines for construction.

Conclusion

While I appreciate what NESARA law will accomplish, we must not stop there. We must finish the job. For the aforementioned reasons, ultimately we must scrap the Constitution, despite the veneration in which many hold it, and reinstitute the Articles of Confederation.

There is one last reason to abolish the Constitution: the implication (at least on the surface) that the United States of America and the states are equals. They aren't, or at least shouldn't be, and that fact properly should be reflected by different types of founding document. Let there be *no possibility* of confusion.

Considering that the states in existence following the Civil War got new constitutions, which effectively converted them into provinces, each state must return to it's *original* constitution and properly revise it. An example of the changes wrought by the advent of those secondary constitutions is that California became "The State of California," a sub-province of the United States of America. These were game-changing events. The more recent states must adopt constitutions more on the order of the earlier states.

As the states once again become sovereign, their constitutions must contain descriptions of metes and bounds, establishing geographical boundaries of the states. After all, they are countries with land masses.

Though I didn't go into the second or current state constitutions in the article, they also were part of the Jesuits' empire building. Furthermore, each of the original state Constitutions, not to mention the constitutions of the later states, should be rewritten with the foregoing ideas in mind.

These changes must be made to make us whole.